

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 CAMINO PROPERTIES, LLC, a foreign
4 limited liability company,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 INSURANCE COMPANY OF THE WEST, a
8 California company, DOE INDIVIDUALS 1
9 through 100, inclusive; ROE ENTITIES 1
10 through 100, inclusive, BOE BONDING
COMPANIES 1 through 100, inclusive,

11 Defendants.
12

Case No. 2:13-cv-02262-APG-CWH

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

13
14 The trial of this matter was conducted on March 7, 8, 14, 15, and 16, 2016 without a jury.

15 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a), I set forth my findings of fact and conclusions of law.
16

17 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

18 1. The original owner/developer of the Camino Al Norte Townhomes project
19 (“Project”) was Camino Al Norte Properties, LLC (“Original Developer”).

20 2. The Project is located within the City of North Las Vegas (“CNLV”).
21 CNLV required the Original Developer to enter into a Subdivision Offsite Improvements
22 Agreement (“Offsite Improvement Agreement”) as a condition for approval of the Project. [Ex
23 502]

24 3. As a further condition for approval of the Project and in accordance with the
25 Offsite Improvement Agreement, the Original Developer was required to post a performance
26 bond in the amount of \$733,541.80.
27
28

1 12. ICW hired Roel Consulting as its consultant, which retained Western States
2 Companies as the completion contractor to complete the work on the punchlist. [Ex 511] The
3 work performed by Western States included both offsite and onsite work. [Ex 513]

4 13. On July 8, 2010, a CNLV employee wrote on the punchlist "Field Items
5 Complete." [Ex 516] However, not all work on the punchlist was completed. For instance, no
6 as-built drawings were submitted to and approved by CNLV. Even if it had been completed, the
7 punchlist did not contain all of the work needed to satisfy full completion of the work in the
8 Offsite Improvement Agreement.

9 14. Subsequently, ICW requested that CNLV reduce or release the Performance Bond.
10 CNLV estimated the costs to complete the remaining work under the Offsite Improvement
11 Agreement to be \$586,058.20. [Ex 24]

12 15. On August 16, 2010, ICW adjuster David Lee Styers was told by CNLV
13 representative Dale Daffern that ICW would have to complete onsite work in order to have the
14 Performance Bond Released. [Styers depo at 29:8-14; deposition exhibit 83; Ex 517]

15 16. ICW and CNLV never reached an agreement on the reduction or release of the
16 Performance Bond.

17 17. Section of 10 the Offsite Improvement Agreement provides that "[a]ny application
18 for release of the surety upon the completion of the improvements by the Developer shall not be
19 granted unless accompanied by a written certificate from the Director [of Public Works] stating
20 that all requirements have been completed in accordance with the terms of the [Offsite
21 Improvement] Agreement." [Ex 502]

22 18. ICW did not obtain a "written certificate" from CNLV's Director of Public Works
23 stating that all requirements had been completed in accordance with the terms of the Offsite
24 Improvement Agreement.

25 19. ICW did not make a timely claim or demand on the FDIC to enforce the SAL that
26 Community Bank put up as security for the Performance Bond. [Ex 124] On July 27, 2011, ICW
27 closed its file on the Project without seeking recovery. [Id.]

21. Plaintiff Camino Properties, LLC (“Camino”) acquired the Project by way of the foreclosure sale. Prior to the purchase, representatives of Camino negotiated with representatives of CNLV about who would complete and pay for the work covered by the Offsite Improvement Agreement. Camino felt it could not profitably develop the Project if it had to absorb the cost of completing that work. Although no written agreement was put in place at that time, Camino believed CNLV would make demand on ICW to complete the work or surrender the bond amount to pay for the work to be completed.

23. On April 7, 2011, CNLV wrote to Camino that it would not make demand on ICW to complete the work because the remaining work was “private improvements.” [Ex 521] This represented a change in CNLV’s policy, due in part to its poor economic condition at the time and its desire not become liable for construction and maintenance of improvements on private property. [Ex 526]

25. Camino did not enter into an offsite improvement agreement with CNLV nor did it assume the obligations of ICW the Original Developer under the Offsite Improvement Agreement for the Project.

1 26. On June 16, 2011, Camino and CNLV entered into a letter agreement which
2 allowed Camino to complete construction of the on-site elements of the existing 36 units and 24
3 foundations without requiring a new bond. [Ex 523] The letter agreement also obligated CNLV
4 to issue the necessary building permits on or before June 30, 2011. [Id.] The agreement did not
5 obligate Camino to complete the work under the Offsite Improvement Agreement, and the parties
6 left for later resolution who would complete and pay for that work. [Ex 528 at 3, ¶12]

7 27. On April 12, 2012, Camino and CNLV entered into a second letter agreement in
8 which CNLV agreed not to require a bond for the completion of construction for the remaining 86
9 units of the Project. [Ex 527] This agreement likewise did not obligate Camino to complete the
10 work under the Offsite Improvement Agreement, and the parties again left for later resolution
11 who would complete and pay for that work. [Ex 528 at 3, ¶12]

12 28. Camino and CNLV continued negotiating over completion of and payment for the
13 work under the Offsite Improvement Agreement. On approximately October 23, 2012, Camino's
14 counsel (Stephanie Allen) sent to CNLV a draft assignment of CNLV's rights under the
15 Performance Bond. [Ex 528 at 3, ¶14] Ms. Allen testified that she believed CNLV had agreed to
16 assign the Performance Bond to Camino and she would not have drafted that document unless an
17 agreement had been reached between CNLV and Camino.

18 29. On or about December 7, 2012, CNLV requested that Camino provide a video of
19 the sewer system installed by the Original Developer at the Project, to verify that the sewer
20 system was built in accordance with the Offsite Improvement Agreement and all applicable codes
21 and regulations.

22 30. The video revealed potential defects in installation, so CNLV directed Camino to
23 clean the sewer and "re-video the entire sanitary system (both built and un-built areas) so that an
24 accurate assessment can be made regarding minimum repairs to be required to bring the sanitary
25 sewer system to an adequate level of service." [Ex 26, 531]

1 31. The video of the sewer system and approval of the system was a requirement for
2 ICW's completion of the Offsite Improvement Agreement and release of its obligations under the
3 performance bond.

4 32. Camino videoed and tested the sewer as directed by CNLV. That revealed that the
5 sewer installed by the Original Developer was defectively constructed and the flows were not in
6 compliance with the plans, specifications, and CNLV building codes and regulations.

7 33. On February 22, 2013, ICW's adjuster David Lee Styers again spoke with CNLV
8 representative Dale Daffern in an attempt to reduce or release the Performance Bond. [Ex 124]
9 CNLV refused to release the bond unless ICW put up security in the amount of \$2,500 per lot.
10 ICW declined to do that, and decided "the best course of action appears to be to do nothing
11 further unless/until contacted by the obligee." [Id.]

12 34. On May 6, 2013, Camino's new counsel wrote to CNLV again requesting that it
13 execute the draft assignment of CNLV's bond rights based upon the parties' earlier agreement in
14 principle. [Ex 532]

15 35. On May 7, 2013, Camino made claim against ICW on the Performance Bond as a
16 result of the sewer system defects. [Ex 533] In its claim to ICW, Camino invited ICW to visit the
17 site to inspect the defects before repairs were commenced. ICW did not inspect the defects. ICW
18 responded that as Camino was not the obligee on the Performance Bond and had no third party
19 rights, Camino had no right to enforce under the Performance Bond.

20 36. On June 12, 2013, Camino and CNLV executed the Assignment of CNLV's rights
21 to the Offsite Improvement Agreement and Performance Bond. [Ex 535] The Assignment states
22 that "it is in the best interests of the Parties to complete or have completed those certain
23 improvements on the Property in order to complete the Project." [Id.] ICW is not a party to the
24 assignment.

25 37. On June 18, 2013, Camino, as assignee of CNLV's rights under the Offsite
26 Improvement Agreement and Performance Bond, made a follow-up demand upon ICW to repair
27 and complete the work or tender the bond proceeds. [Ex 536] ICW denied Camino's demand.

38. In order for Camino to repair the defective work installed by the Original Developer or ICW's contractors, and to complete the remaining work covered by the Performance Bond, Camino had to remove and replace portions of roadways and other work previously installed. Camino also had to complete a substantial amount of other bonded offsite improvement work on the Project. [Ex 529A-E]

39. The work performed by Camino for which it now seeks reimbursement was reasonable and necessary to obtain acceptance by CNLV under the Offsite Improvement Agreement.

40. Camino seeks to recover \$618,249.50 from ICW, which represents the amount that was reasonably and necessarily incurred by Camino to complete and repair the defective work and to fulfill ICW's obligations under the Offsite Improvement Agreement and the Performance Bond.

41. The \$618,249.50 which Camino now seeks reimbursement from ICW is substantiated by the estimate CNLV prepared to determine the costs to complete the Offsite Improvement Work when ICW left the Project in July of 2010.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. Plaintiff's Causes of Action

First Cause of Action – Breach of Contract

1. A plaintiff claiming breach of contract must "show (1) the existence of a valid contract, (2) a breach by the defendant, and (3) damage as a result of the breach." *Saini v. Int'l Game Tech.*, 434 F. Supp. 2d 913, 919-20 (D. Nev. 2006) (citing *Richardson v. Jones*, 1 Nev. 405, 405 (Nev. 1865)).

2. In general, contracts are freely assignable in the absence of language to the contrary. *Ruiz v. City of N. Las Vegas*, 255 P.3d 216, 221 (Nev. 2011). The law looks with favor on the free assignability of rights. *Id.* (citing 9 JOHN E. MURRAY, JR., CORBIN ON CONTRACTS § 49.9, at 214 (rev. ed. 2007)).

1 3. Neither the Offsite Improvement Agreement nor the Performance Bond prohibits
2 assignment.

3 4. Pursuant to the “Assignment of Rights,” CNLV transferred and assigned to
4 Camino “...all rights, title, interest, claims that [CNLV] may have related to the Offsite
5 [Improvement] Agreement and [Performance] Bond.”

6 5. The assignment did not enlarge the obligations of ICW, it only changed the
7 identity of the party to whom the obligations were owed.

8 6. A public entity may assign a construction performance bond like the one at issue
9 in this case if the assignment is made for the purpose of completing the improvements in
10 question. *Clearwater Associates, Inc. v. F. H. Bridge & Son, Contractors*, 365 A.2d 200, 204
11 (App. Div. 1976) (“We therefore hold that a municipality may assign its rights under a bond
12 where the assignment is for the purpose of obtaining the performance guaranteed by the bond and
13 upon a showing that the improvements have been made. We perceive no reason why a surety,
14 compensated for the obligation it assumes to a municipality, should be exonerated in
15 circumstances where its liability to the municipality on the bond is clear, simply because the
16 bargained-for improvements were completed by an assignee of the claim by agreement with the
17 municipality. The purpose of the bond, to provide the means by which a municipality may insure
18 completion of a bargained for performance, will be fulfilled by this holding.”); *see also*,
19 *Transduller Ctr. Ltd. P’ship v. USX Corp.*, 761 F. Supp. 430, 436 (E.D. VA. 1991); *Bd. of Sup’rs*
20 *of Fairfax Cnty. v. Ecology One, Inc.*, 245 S.E. 2d 425 (VA. 1978); *Will Cnty. v. Woodhill*
21 *Enterprises, Inc.*, 4 Ill. App. 3d 68, 75 (1971). So long as there is a public purpose for the
22 assignment, the assignment will be upheld. *Transduller*, 761 F. Supp. at 436. The public purpose
23 of achieving completion of the construction is not diminished by the fact that construction has
24 been substantially completed prior to the assignment. *Id.* (finding that Transduller had partially
25 completed the required work).

26 7. CNLV’s “Assignment of Rights” states that “[i]t is in the best interest of the
27 Parties to complete or have completed these certain improvement on the Property in order to

1 complete the Project . . . at no cost to” Camino. [Ex 535 at ICW000359] Camino began to
2 perform the bonded work with the agreement in principle with CNLV that the Performance Bond
3 would be assigned to Camino to pay for that work. The Assignment confirms that agreement and
4 was made to obtain completion of the bonded work. Thus, the Assignment is valid and
5 enforceable.

6 8. Under general principles of assignment law, an assignee steps into the shoes of the
7 assignor. *Boyajian v. New Falls Corp. (In re Boyajian)*, 564 F.3d 1088, 1091 (9th Cir. 2009). As
8 a result of the Assignment of Rights, Camino stepped into the shoes of CNLV as obligee under
9 the Performance Bond.

10 9. Pursuant to the Offsite Improvement Agreement, “[i]f the construction or
11 installation of any improvements or facilities are not completed . . . as prescribed by [CNLV]; or
12 if such construction is not in accordance with applicable regulations, standards, specifications and
13 ordinances of [CNLV], then, in any of such events, [CNLV] may, at its option, proceed to
14 complete said improvements at the expense of the Developer under any of the security or surety
15 pledged pursuant to this [Offsite Improvement Agreement] and ordinances relating to such
16 security or surety.”

17 10. The Original Developer and ICW failed to properly construct a portion of the
18 bonded sewer system as required by the Offsite Improvement Agreement, and failed to complete
19 the work required under the Offsite Improvement Agreement.

20 11. As assignee of CNLV’s rights under the Performance Bond and Offsite
21 Improvement Agreement, Camino had a legal right to demand completion and/or correction of
22 any of the bonded work that was not completed in accordance with Offsite Improvement
23 Agreement, or to receive payment of the proceeds of the Performance Bond to pay for such work.

24 12. ICW materially breached its obligations under the Performance Bond by, among
25 other things, not performing repairs to the defectively constructed sewer system, not properly
26 completing the work under the Offsite Improvement Agreement, and not tendering the proceeds
27 of the bond in a sufficient amount to cover the costs to complete the work.

1
2 **Fourth Cause of Action – Declaratory Relief**

3 18. Given that Camino has prevailed on its claim for breach of contract, this cause of
4 action is moot.

5 **CONCLUSION**

6 Based on the foregoing, Camino has proven that ICW breached its contractual obligations
7 owed to Camino, and Camino is entitled to recover upon its first cause of action asserting breach
8 of contract.

9
10 ACCORDINGLY, Camino Properties, LLC is awarded \$618,249.50 against Insurance
11 Company of the West. The clerk of the court shall enter judgment accordingly.

12 Dated: March 23, 2016.

13 

14 _____
15 ANDREW P. GORDON
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28